

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

GOOGLE LLC,
Petitioner,

v.

SECURITY FIRST INNOVATIONS, LLC,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2024-00212

Patent 11,178,116

**PATENT OWNER SECURITY FIRST INNOVATIONS, LLC'S
REQUEST FOR ORAL ARGUMENT**

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.70 and the Board’s Scheduling Order (Paper 16), Security First Innovations, LLC (“Patent Owner”) respectfully requests oral argument, as currently scheduled for February 20, 2025. Patent Owner is concurrently sending an email to the Board requesting that the oral argument be moved to February 27, 28 or March 3.¹ A substantially identical request is being made in each of Patent Owner’s Requests For Oral Argument in IPR2024-00212, -00214, and -00215.

Consolidation of Argument: IPR2024-00212 is one of three IPRs challenging related patents (IPR2024-00212, -00214, and -0215). The three IPRs have overlapping grounds and arguments. *See, e.g.*, IPR2024-00212 POR, 38-70 (addressing Foster/Hayhurst ground); IPR2024-00215 POR, 32-71 (addressing Foster/Hayhurst ground); IPR2024-00214 POR, 32-56 (addressing Foster ground). For the sake of efficiency and to avoid potentially inconsistent records, Patent Owner respectfully requests a joint oral argument for the three related proceedings.

120 Minutes of Argument Per Side Requested: The three related IPRs challenge three different patents, spanning several discrete and complex issues. If the cases are consolidated, Patent Owner respectfully requests that the parties receive at least 2 hours (120 minutes) of total argument time per side. The Board

¹ Petitioner has indicated that it takes no position on this request.

has routinely allowed 120 minutes of argument or more per side where multiple patents are argued. *Mianyang BOE Optoelects. Tech. Co., Ltd. v. Samsung Display Co., Ltd.*, IPR2023-01075, Paper 36, 2 (Aug. 27, 2024) (3 IPRs, 3 patents, same parties, 120 minutes of total argument time per side); *LifeCORE Fitness, LLC v. Woodway USA, Inc.*, IPR2023-00834, Paper 37, 2-3 (June 24, 2024) (3 IPRs, 3 patents, same parties, 120 minutes of total argument time per side); *Magic Leap, Inc. v. Percept Techs Inc.*, IPR2023-00494, Paper 17, 2-3 (Apr. 3, 2024) (2 IPRs, 2 patents, same parties, 120 minutes of total argument time per side); *Intuit, Inc. v. Samesurf, Inc.*, IPR2023-00342, Paper 39, 2 (Feb. 23, 2024) (3 IPRs, 3 patents, same parties, 120 minutes of total argument time per side).

Request For In-Person Hearing: Patent Owner respectfully requests an in-person hearing in Alexandria, Virginia. Patent Owner understands that Petitioner has requested a remote hearing. Should the hearings occur remotely, Patent Owner respectfully requests a 1 p.m. Eastern start time as Patent Owner's counsel are predominately located in Los Angeles.

Reservation of Time: Patent Owner requests an opportunity to reserve sur-rebuttal time to respond to rebuttal arguments by Petitioner, and an opportunity to provide a closing statement. *Compare, e.g., Mangrove Partners Master Fund, Ltd. et al. v. VirnetX, Inc.*, IPR2015-01046/01047, Paper 60, 2 (June 2, 2016) ("Both parties may reserve some of their argument time for rebuttal, and Patent Owner

will be afforded an opportunity to provide a closing statement along with any rebuttal.”).

Issues for Argument: Without waiving any issue not specifically identified, Patent Owner specifies at least the following issues it may discuss at argument:

- Issues related to the instituted grounds, including, for example, claim construction, level of ordinary skill in the art, anticipation, obviousness, analogous art, motivation to combine, and reasonable expectation of success;
- The timeliness of the arguments raised in the proceedings;
- Any other relevant issues raised in papers filed in this proceeding, including issues raised in papers yet to be filed; and
- Any other issues that the Board deems necessary for issuing a Final Written Decision, including any questions, rebuttals, or arguments that may arise during the oral argument.

The Board’s advance guidance is respectfully solicited as to any questions the Board specifically wishes to be addressed.

Equipment: Should the Board order an in-person hearing, Patent Owner requests the ability to use a computer, projector, and screen to display possible demonstratives and exhibits.

Respectfully submitted,

/ Stephen J. Elliott /

Stephen J. Elliott (Reg. No. 52,858)

Andrei Iancu (Reg. No. 41,862)

SULLIVAN & CROMWELL LLP

Kenneth J. Weatherwax (Reg. No. 54,528)

Nathan Lowenstein, *pro hac vice*

Colette Woo, *pro hac vice*

LOWENSTEIN & WEATHERWAX LLP

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned hereby certifies that the following documents were served
by electronic service, by agreement between the parties, on the date below:

**PATENT OWNER SECURITY FIRST INNOVATION, LLC'S
REQUEST FOR ORAL ARGUMENT**

The names and addresses of the parties being served are as follows:

Elisabeth H. Hunt	EHunt-PTAB@wolfgreenfield.com
Richard F. Giunta	RGiunta-PTAB@wolfgreenfield.com
Marc S. Johannes	MJohannes-PTAB@wolfgreenfield.co
Gregory S. Nieberg	GNieberg-PTAB@wolfgreenfield.com

Respectfully submitted,

/ Colette Woo /

Date: January 9, 2025